

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nielsen* (US 6,006,333) in view of *Pond et al.* (US 4,864,616) and *Schneier, Applied Cryptography*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1996. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 10) recites a step of "in response to the receipt of a cookie generated by an application from a remote server, encrypting said cookie with said public key." Thus, according to the claimed invention, the cookie is originated from a remote server. On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner analogized the user IDs and passwords of *Nielsen* as the claimed cookie. However, the user IDs and passwords of *Nielsen* are different from the claimed cookie because the user IDs and passwords of *Nielsen* are manually entered by a user either ahead of time (col. 5, lines 44-47) or responding to a request in real time (col. 6, lines 12-14) instead automatically received from a remote server without any user intervention.

In addition, according to *Nielsen*, the user IDs and passwords are encrypted by a master password entered by a user after being prompted (col. 4, line 31). In contrast, the claimed cookie is encrypted by a public key previously stored in a protected storage device. Even though *Nielsen* also teaches the master password can be stored in a storage device, but according to *Nielsen*, the master password is stored in a system memory (col. 4, lines 31-32). Since the system memory is a non-protected device, *Nielsen's* teachings are different from that of the claimed invention. Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Furthermore, since *Nielsen* teaches the master password to be stored in an unprotected system memory, it would not have obvious to one skilled in the art to store the master password in a protected storage device similar to what is disclosed in *Pond*, as suggested by the Examiner

on page 3 of the Final Office Action. In fact, *Nielsen* has already offered a perfect solution for enhancing the security of the master password and that is "never store the master password" (col. 4, lines 36-37). In order to combine the teachings of *Nielsen* and *Pond* for rendering the claimed invention obvious, one is required to overcome the above-mentioned conflict between the teachings of *Nielsen* and *Pond*. This is because according to MPEP § 2143.01, when there is a conflict between the teachings of two or more prior art references, "the Examiner must weigh the power of each reference to suggest solutions to one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the degree to which one reference might accurately discredit another" (emphasis added). The Examiner did not demonstrate how the conflicting teachings of *Nielsen* and *Pond* could be reconciled by a person of ordinary skill in the art; thus, the combination of *Nielsen* and *Pond* for the § 103 rejection is deemed to be improper.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 10 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Deposit Account No. **50-0563**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP
P.O. Box 969
Austin, Texas 78767-0969
(512) 472-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS